REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

Claim 1has been amended.

Claims 2, 3, and 9 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer to recite grouping of data into a priority file and storing the priority file in a predetermined server. This feature was originally recited in claim 14 (although not in combination with the hooking function), and is disclosed beginning in line 2 on page 12 and continuing to line 21 on page 15. Therefore, the additions to claims 2, 3, and 9 do not represent "new matter."

The rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091763 (Shah) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Shah publication fails to disclose or suggest a method of controlling a user application program in which a request for an arbitrary data block:

a.   causes a file streaming readout function to initially identify a priority file with which the data block is associated;

b.   check whether the data block is locally stored, and

c.   retrieve the data block from a predetermined server if it is not locally stored.

According to paragraphs [0313] to [0315] of the Shah publication, frequently used file blocks are pre-stored on the *client machine* so that there is <u>no need</u> to refer to a predetermined server during execution of the user application program. Shah does not teach pre-storage of the priority blocks on a "predetermined server," as claimed, but rather teaches storage of frequently used data blocks in local storage to avoid having to access the predetermined server to obtain the frequently used data.

It is true that paragraph [0284] of the Shah publication discusses "load balancing" by grouping storing more frequently used blocks on multiple servers. In the first Official Action,

the Examiner cited this paragraph with respect to original claim 14. However, storing the most frequently used blocks on the most servers (improving execution speed by having more servers available and eliminating rarely used files from most of the servers) is not the same as storing priority files on a predetermined server. According to paragraph [0284] of Shah, the _most_ used applications are assigned to the most servers, and the least used applications are assigned to the smallest number of servers. There is no suggestion of storing priority files on a predetermined server accessed directly by the streaming readout function if the data block corresponding to the priority files is not locally stored.

The currently claimed invention improves handling of priority files by not locally storing data blocks until actual use, even if the priority files are the most frequently used files, thereby enabling use of a smaller cache while still providing a quick response to requests for data included in the priority files. As a result, the claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious over the Shah publication, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome the sole rejection made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejection and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: October 2, 2006

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\beu\Pending A...H\C\CHUNO 623508\a02.wpd

5